



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/873,249

06/05/2001

Shigehiro Kadota

35.C15408

5979

5514

7590

09/07/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

JORGENSEN, LELAND R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/873,249

Applicant(s)

KADOTA, SHIGEHIRO

Examiner

Leland R. Jorgensen

Art Unit

2675

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the _____ application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1 - 7.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


DENNIS-DOON CHOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In a prior response, applicant argued that Bruning does not teach that "the first and second display devices divisionally display an image." In the final office action, examiner objected to the drawings because the drawing do not show first and second display devices divisionally display an image. The examiner argued that how the first and second devices divisionally display an image is neither defined in the specification nor shown in the drawing. After noting that the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow, examiner concluded that Bruning teaches the first and second display devices may display the same image. The presenter has the option of allowing all parties to enter markings altering the electronic presentation image to include newly manually drawn material or the presenter may divisionally display the image so that the attendees entries are blocked or do not alter the permanent image of the electronic presentation. In response to the final action, applicant argues that drawing show that how the image is transferred to the first and second display device and repeats the prior argument that Bruning does not teach that "the first and second display devices divisionally display an image. Applicant neither explains what is meant by "divisionally display an image", shows where in the specification or drawings that such divisionally display is explained or illustrated, nor attempts to counter examiner's interpretation of Bruning that the presenter may divisionally display the image. Thus, examiner's prima facie rejection remains un rebutted.